There were so many flashes going off it was blinding. It was a marvel to the world, the ushering in of indoor baseball.

I've got to say, there was nothing else like the Dome. I remember the players would stand in centerfield and hit balls straight up to see if they could hit the roof. And who could forget the gun slinging cowboy on the scoreboard? It was the best.

My kids remember going to the games, wearing Nolan Ryan's number 34, and cheering for players like Terry Puhl, Joe Niekro, Craig Reynolds, Alan Ashby, Billy Doran and yelling out Jose Cruni-u-u-u-u-z. Of course we have had many greats along the way, including Biggio, Bagwell and Berkman—the Killer B's. But one of my all-time favorite players happens to be none other than Kingwood's own, ''Scrap-Iron'' Phil Garner. You may not have known it, but we have been living amongst a legend right here in our own backyard.

Phil Garner was known for his hard-nosed style of baseball. His defense as an infielder, playing both second and third base in his career, earned him the nickname ''Scrap-Iron.'' He was known for breaking up double plays, diving for balls, and always playing tough. He left it all on the field every play, every game. He didn't start his career in Texas, but like I say about all great transplants—he got here as fast as he could. And lucky for us he did.

As a two-time All-American for the Tennessee Volunteers, he was drafted by Oakland in 1971. Ten years, three All-Star appearances and a .500 average in a World Series victory with the Pirates later, he landed in Houston. After hanging up his cleats, he hired on as an assistant coach under then Astros Manager Art Howe. He went on to later become manager for the Detroit Tigers and Milwaukee Brewers before coming back to Houston. And like I said, lucky for us he did.

As Skipper for the Astros, Garner led the team to greater success than any other manager in franchise history. Among the many successes the team had under his leadership, nothing was greater than the team's first and only World Series appearance. Even though I lost the bet with a Chicago Congressman and had to send them some real Texas barbeque from the ''Tin Roof'' Bar-B-Q when the White Sox beat the Astros, I went down swinging with ''Scrap Iron.''

I have known Phil and his family for many years. His example and character has had a tremendous impact on my son, Kurt, as well as many other young people that have had the pleasure of knowing him. The Astros, and the entire city of Houston, are lucky to call him one of our own.

The great thing about baseball is everyone can enjoy the game. You don't have to be the biggest or the fastest to play. And if you don't want to take out a loan to go to a major league game, there's still plenty of ball to been seen. You will be hard pressed not to find a little league, high school or college game just about any day of the week and I can assure you our local talent won't disappoint and won't break the bank.

I can't wait to start baseball all over again—this time as a grandfather and take my grandsons and granddaughters to the ''National Pastime.'' I wish all the area youth leagues, high schools, colleges and of course, the 'Stros the best of luck this season. Now, let's play ball!

And that's just the way it is.

AN ACCURATE ESTIMATE OF THE COST OF A CAP AND TRADE PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 2009

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I would like to bring attention to a letter sent by John M. Reilly, of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, to Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER. During the debate on the FY10 Budget Resolution, the cost of a cap and trade program became a major point of contention. Mr. Reilly, in this letter, clearly explains the methodology used by MIT to determine the approximate cost to an average family of a cap and trade proposal. As the letter makes evident, the actual cost to the average American family will likely be far less than estimated by our friends on the other side of aisle.

JOINT PROGRAM ON THE SCIENCE AND POLICY OF GLOBAL CHANGE, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,

Cambridge, MA, April 1, 2009.

Representative JOHN BOEHNER (R–OH),
Office of the House Republican Leader, Washington, DC.

It has come to my attention that an analysis we conducted examining proposals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, Report No. 146, Assessment of U.S. Cap-and-Trade Proposals, has been misrepresented in recent press releases distributed by the National Republican Congressional Committee. The press release claims our report estimates an average cost per family of a carbon cap and trade program that would meet targets now being discussed in Congress to be over $3,000, but that is nearly 10 times the correct estimate which is approximately $340. Since the issue of legislation to control greenhouse gases is now under consideration, I wanted to take an opportunity to clear up any misunderstanding created by this press release and to avoid further confusion.

Why is this amount so different? As far as I can tell the $3,000+ is based on the potential auction revenue the government could collect by auctioning the allowances over the period through 2050 where a simple average over all years from 2015 to 2050 was computed. The tax revenue collected through such an auction, the costs of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and the average impact on a household are very different concepts. Thus, there are several things wrong with this calculation. First, the auction revenue is determined by the CO_2 price and how many allowances are issued—allowances tell us how many tons of CO_2 (or more broadly greenhouse gases) will continue to be emitted. The cost of reducing emissions depends on how much emissions are reduced not on how much continues to be emitted. Second, the CO_2 price reflects the cost of the last ton of emissions reduced but there are many options that cost much less than avoiding the last ton and so using the CO_2 price multiplied by the number of tons (either reduced or emitted) is also wrong. Third, the average cost to a household depends on how allowances or the allowance revenues are distributed. Fourth, the costs are borne over time and it is wrong to produce a simple average of such costs as that does not take account of the time value of money.

We assumed in the analysis we did that the revenue is returned to households. From data in the report we can calculate the economic cost in each year (percentage loss times the base welfare level in each year), and divide this by the U.S. population, and then multiply this amount by four to estimate the cost for a representative family of four. We further apply an economic discount rate of 4 percent to get the Net Present Value (NPV) cost in each year in the future. Doing this we find that the NPV cost per family of four starts at about $75 in 2015, rises to nearly $510 by 2025, and then falls to $205 by 2050. We can calculate the average annual NPV cost per family by summing over all years and dividing by the number of years, and this shows the average annual net present value cost to be about $340—only a part of which would be actual energy bill increases. This $340 includes the direct effects of higher energy prices, the cost of measures to reduce energy use such as adding insulation to homes, the higher price of goods that are produced using energy, and impacts on wages and returns on capital. The cost per household will vary from our hypothetical average family of four depending on the household's circumstances. Those households with large heating and cooling bills because of the climate in which they live or who drive more than average will face higher costs. Those with smaller homes who live in benign climates will have lower costs. The higher energy prices encourage reductions in energy use by increasing the payback on improvements in energy efficiency, and through such investments households can avoid paying more for energy. Jobs and wages in fossil fuel industries are likely to decline but job opportunities will increase in industries that produce alternative energy sources or that provide ways to save energy.

While the $340 average annual cost we estimate for a family is just one tenth of the $3000+ cited in the misleading press release, Congress should address the costs of this transition for middle and lower income families while developing Cap-and-Trade legislation. In another paper (Report 160, Analysis of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Tax Proposals) we make some calculations on the burdens of a GHG tax on families at different income levels. Our Report 160 shows that the costs on lower and middle income households can be completely offset by returning allowance revenue to these households.

Climate change poses severe risks for the U.S. and the world. It will take efforts in the U.S. and abroad to reduce emissions substantially to avoid the most serious risks of climate change. One of the perplexing aspects of the problem is that the solution involves using cleaner energy sources that are more costly then conventional fossil fuels. And the higher energy prices needed to cover the higher costs will fall disproportionately on the poorer members of society in the U.S. and in the world. However, the less wealthy members of our economy also stand to suffer most from climate change—whether it is through the risks of increased food prices if climate change disrupts crops, the lack of access to air conditioning under extreme heat, or vulnerability to other extreme weather and storm events such as hurricanes which may increase with climate change. Many of the proposals currently being considered by Congress and as proposed by the Administration have been designed to offset the energy cost impacts on middle and lower income households and so it is simplistic and misleading to only look at

the impact on energy prices of these proposals as a measure of their impact on the average household. Concern about the cost impacts on middle and low income families needs to be focused on making sure allowance or tax revenue is used to offset cost impacts on these households rather than as an excuse for not proceeding with measures that would help avert dangerous climate change.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. REILLY.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JIM SAXTON'S CAREER

HON. JOHN H. ADLER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 2009

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, my predecessor, former Congressman Jim Saxton faithfully represented the 3rd Congressional District of New Jersey for 24 years. His lifelong dedication to public service and integrity made him one of the most respected Members of the House of Representatives.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Armed Services, Congressman Saxton was able to save 17,000 jobs and create 1,500 new ones by pushing through legislation to create the country's first Army-Air Force-Navy megabase by combining Fort Dix, McGuire AFB and Lakehurst Naval Air Station.

Congressman Saxton also left a lasting environmental legacy for New Jersey and for the United States. As a high ranking member of the House Natural Resources Committee and co-founder of the bipartisan Congressional Wildlife Refuge Caucus, the Congressman was dedicated to preserving the county's natural treasures and safeguarding the environment for future generations.

Congressman Jim Saxton's career is a shining example of bipartisanship and public service. I am humbled to represent the district that elected such a worthy and honorable man for over two decades.

In honor of Congressman Saxton's service to the residents of New Jersey's 3rd Congressional District I have sponsored legislation, H.R. 986, which would name the post office in Mount Holly, New Jersey after him. I hope my colleagues will cosponsor this legislation to honor their former colleague.

STOP MARKETING TOBACCO PRODUCTS TO KIDS

HON. MARY JO KILROY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 21, 2009

Ms. KILROY. Madam Speaker, for far too long, there has been a lack of oversight and regulation of a product that causes more than 392,000 deaths in the U.S. each year. Our constituents, I'd contend, would be shocked to know what little oversight actually exists over tobacco products—the fuel driving the leading cause of preventable death in the United States.

Today I want to tell you about a new, despicable product being sold in 3 cities around the country, including my hometown of Columbus, Ohio. Reynolds America is currently using my constituents in Columbus as guinea pigs and testing a smokeless tobacco product that looks like a mint. How is a child supposed to tell the difference between a mint that freshens your breath and one that gives you cancer?

According to an article in a suburban Columbus newspaper, many high school students are using smokeless tobacco during school hours. The American Lung Association has confirmed with school janitors that they are finding smokeless tobacco pouches in the trash—confirming that kids are using smokeless tobacco in class. These new forms of tobacco will only make it easier for children to get access to tobacco products and become lifelong addicts. They won't even have to dispose of the evidence.

What we need is for Congress to finally pass into law the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. This legislation would finally give the U.S. Food and Drug Administration authority to regulate deadly tobacco products. Among other items in this bill, the FDA would be granted authority to regulate these appalling new smokeless, dissolvable tobacco products that are now hitting the market in Columbus.

Chairman WAXMAN stated the other day that he intends to move this legislation "very, very soon." I thank him for his leadership and urge this chamber to do just that so we can reduce the addiction, disease, and death caused by these products.